arXiv:1512.02534v1 [physics.comp-ph] 8 Dec 2015

Critical exponents for the cloud-crystal phase transition of charged particles in a Paul Trap

D. K. Weiss, Y. S. Nam, and R. Blümel
Department of Physics, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Connecticut 06459-0155
(Dated: December 9, 2015)

It is well known that charged particles stored in a Paul trap, one of the most versatile tools in atomic and molecular physics, may undergo a phase transition from a disordered cloud state to a geometrically well-ordered crystalline state (the Wigner crystal). In this paper we show that the average lifetime $\bar{\tau}_m$ of the metastable cloud state preceding the cloud $\to$ crystal phase transition follows a powerlaw, $\bar{\tau}_m \sim (\gamma - \gamma_c)^{-\beta}$, $\gamma > \gamma_c$, where γ_c is the critical value of the damping constant γ at which the cloud $\to$ crystal phase transition occurs. The critical exponent β depends on the trap control parameter q, but is independent of the number of particles N stored in the trap and the trap control parameter a, which determines the shape (oblate, prolate, or spherical) of the cloud. For $q = 0.15, 0.20$, and 0.25, we find $\beta = 1.20 \pm 0.03$, $\beta = 1.61 \pm 0.09$, and $\beta = 2.38 \pm 0.12$, respectively. In addition we find that for given a and q, the critical value γ_c of the damping scales approximately like $\gamma_c = C \ln[\ln(N)] + D$ as a function of N, where C and D are constants. Beyond their relevance for Wigner crystallization of nonneutral plasmas in Paul traps and mini storage rings, we conjecture that our results are also of relevance for the field of crystalline beams.

PACS numbers: 37.10.Ty, 52.27.Jt, 52.50.Qt

The Paul trap [1, 2] is an electrodynamic device for storing charged particles for very long periods of time, free from contact with material walls. Trapping is achieved by applying suitable dc and ac voltages to the hyperbolic electrodes of the trap. The resulting electric potentials create an effective potential minimum at the center of the trap, an immaterial trough that confines charged particles, in principle, forever. Storage times ranging from a few hours [3] to a few days [4] have been reported.

Theoretically and experimentally, trapping of a single charged particle in an ideal Paul trap is understood in detail [1, 2], and even its quantum regime has already been explored [5, 6]. However, if multiple particles are stored in the trap simultaneously, the Coulomb interactions between the particles cause their motions to be chaotic [2, 3, 7]. In this case it is no longer possible to solve their equations of motion analytically. The chaotic motion of the particles has two consequences. (i) Due to the resulting high temperatures, we do not have to worry about quantum effects; a classical description of the trapped particles is sufficient. (ii) The chaotic motion of the particles in the trap causes the phenomenon of radio-frequency (rf) heating [3, 8]. Damping must be imparted to this system to counteract the heating, whether through laser cooling [3], buffer gas cooling [4], or some other method, for instance cooling by the cold, neutral particles of a magneto-optic trap [9]. With a relatively small damping, the rf heating power of the cloud will come into equilibrium with the cooling power, resulting from the damping mechanism, and a stationary-state gas cloud will result [3, 10, 11]. However, with stronger damping, the heating of the cloud can be overcome, and the particles will transition into the crystalline phase [3, 4, 12, 13], the Wigner crystal [14]. We chose the Paul trap as a representative for a much wider class of periodically driven many-particle systems that also show Wigner crystallization and include particle accelerator beams [15, 16], dusty plasmas [17, 18], surface state electrons [19], and colloidal suspensions [20, 21].

In this paper we use large-scale molecular dynamics simulations to show that the cloud $\to$ crystal phase transition may be interpreted as a critical phenomenon [22] and we calculate the critical exponent. We also present a scaling law for the critical damping necessary to achieve crystallization in the Paul trap.

The coupled equations of motion governing the dynamics of N particles stored in the Paul trap, in dimensionless units [10], are

$$\ddot{\vec{r}}_i + \gamma\dot{\vec{r}}_i + [a - 2q\sin(2\tau)] \begin{pmatrix} x_i \\ y_i \\ -2z_i \end{pmatrix} = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ j\neq i}}^{N} \frac{\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j}{|\vec{r}_i - \vec{r}_j|^3}, \quad i = 1, \ldots, N, \tag{1}$$

where $\vec{r} = (x, y, z)$, τ is the dimensionless time, γ is the damping constant, N is the number of trapped particles, and a, q are the trap's dimensionless control parameters [10], proportional to the dc and ac voltages applied to the trap's electrodes, respectively. The conversion between time τ and the number n of rf cycles is accomplished via $n = \tau/\pi$. For given values of N, a, q, and γ, we solve (1) numerically with a standard fifth-order Runge-Kutta integrator [23]. Each of our simulations starts at $\tau = 0$ with randomly chosen initial conditions drawn from the phase-space box $-10 < x, y, z < 10$, $-1 < v_x, v_y, v_z < 1$ with a uniform distribution. We checked that, because of the chaotic nature of the particle dynamics in the trap, all of our results are completely insensitive to both the particular choice of random distribution and the size of



FIG. 1: (Color online) Mean-square displacement $\langle x^2(\tau)\rangle$ of a 100-particle cloud for $q = 0.2$, $a = 0.02$, and $\gamma = 8.81 \cdot 10^{-4} > \gamma_c = 8.47 \cdot 10^{-4}$. An initial transient (thermalization stage) is followed by a plateau of length τ_m (metastable state), which ultimately transitions into a state of constant $\langle x^2(\tau)\rangle$ (flat line; crystalline state).



FIG. 2: (Color online) Critical value $\gamma_c(N, q = 0.2, a = 0.02)$ of the damping constant γ [see (1)] as a function of N at which the cloud $\rightarrow$ crystal phase transition occurs (red, closed circles). The best-fitting powerlaw (blue, solid line), log-law (green, solid line), and the iterated-log-law (red, solid line) are also shown. Only the iterated-log-law, according to (2), provides a satisfactory fit.

the box. To monitor the progress of our simulations, we plot $\langle x^2(\tau_n = n\pi)\rangle$, n integer, where the angular brackets indicate an ensemble average over all N particles.

The result of a typical simulation run is shown in Fig. 1. Since they are chosen at random, all of our initial conditions correspond to energetic particle clouds with large initial values of $\langle x^2\rangle$ (see data points for $\tau \approx 0$ in Fig. 1). However, because of the chaotic nature of its dynamics, the particle cloud very quickly loses the memory of its initial conditions and thermalizes. This corresponds to the initial transient [see the near-exponential decay phase over the first $\sim 1,000$ rf cycles ($\tau \approx 0$ to $\tau \approx 3,000$) in Fig. 1], followed by the establishment of a metastable stationary state (see the plateau in Fig. 1 of length $\tau_m \approx 28,000$), where the heating of the cloud comes into equilibrium with the damping. Following this, if, as in Fig. 1, a relatively large γ was chosen, the cloud eventually collapses into the crystal state. In Fig. 1 this final collapse manifests itself as the exponential decay phase immediately following the metastable state (to the right of the second dashed line in Fig. 1) and ending in the crystalline phase, characterized by the absence of fluctuations in $\langle x^2\rangle$ for $\tau \gtrsim 40,000$. We checked explicitly that during its plateau phase the ion cloud is stable in the sense that there are no dynamical variables or expectation values that would decay during τ_m.

Confirming previous experimental [3, 4] and numerical [3] observations, we find that for given N, a, q the cloud $\rightarrow$ crystal phase transition (the final collapse of the cloud in Fig. 1) occurs in the vicinity of a critical value of γ, denoted by γ_c. In addition, corroborating earlier qualitative experimental observations (see, e.g., Fig. 3 in [3]), we find that, for finite N, and a given finite simulation time $\tau_{\max}$, γ_c is not sharply defined. Therefore, to determine γ_c and its uncertainty, we proceed in the following way. For given N, a, q, we scan γ from $\gamma_{\min} = 10^{-4}$ to $\gamma_{\max} = 2 \cdot 10^{-3}$, a γ interval that we know from experience contains γ_c with certainty for N ranging between 20 and 2,000 trapped particles. We find that in the interval $\gamma_{\min} < \gamma < \gamma_1(N, a, q)$, N-particle clouds are stable and never transition into the crystal. Following this is the interval $\gamma_1(N, a, q) < \gamma < \gamma_2(N, a, q)$, an interval of uncertainty, in which the clouds sometimes transition into the crystal and sometimes not. Adjacent to this is the interval $\gamma_2(N, a, q) < \gamma < \gamma_{\max}$, in which all N-particle clouds, independently of initial conditions, always transition into crystals. Defining $\Delta\gamma_c = \gamma_2 - \gamma_1$ as the width of the uncertainty interval, we find that $\Delta\gamma_c$ shrinks, i.e., γ_1 and γ_2 both move toward each other, with increasing number N of stored particles according to $\Delta\gamma_c \sim 1/\sqrt{N}$, and also with the maximal time $\tau_{\max}$ allowed for our simulations. To be practical, however, we limited the run time of our simulations to $\tau_{\max} = 5 \cdot 10^5 \pi$, very much larger than the typical decay time $1/\gamma$ of our system. We found that this choice of $\tau_{\max}$ yielded consistent results, and we saw no need to increase $\tau_{\max}$. Having determined the uncertainty interval $[\gamma_1, \gamma_2]$, we define $\gamma_c = (\gamma_1 + \gamma_2)/2$.

As an example, for $q = 0.2$, $a = q^2/2$, and N ranging from 25 to 1,000 particles, we plot, in Fig. 2, the γ_c values (red, closed circles) determined according to the numerical procedure described above. The uncertainty $\Delta\gamma_c$ of γ_c is smaller than the size of the plot symbols in Fig. 2. We found that neither a powerlaw ($\gamma_c = AN^B + C$, where A, B, C are fit parameters; blue, solid line in Fig. 2) nor a log-law [$\gamma_c = A \ln(N) + B$, where A, B are fit parameters; green, solid line in Fig. 2] fits the N dependence of γ_c satisfactorily, but that the iterated-log-law

$$\gamma_c(N, q = 0.2, a = 0.02) = C \ln[\ln(N)] + D \qquad (2)$$

(red, solid line in Fig. 2) provides an excellent fit, where $C = 7.49 \cdot 10^{-4}$ and $D = -2.97 \cdot 10^{-4}$. For $N = 100$,

$\gamma_c = 8.47 \cdot 10^{-4}$. This is the reason for why the cloud in Fig. 1, subjected to $\gamma = 8.81 \cdot 10^{-4} > \gamma_c$, ultimately collapses into the crystal state.

At present, we are not able to provide an analytical explanation for the origin of the iterated-log scaling of γ_c. However, the weak N-dependence of γ_c may be understood qualitatively in the following way. Since, in the large-N limit, and close to the cloud $\rightarrow$ crystal phase transition point, charged particles in the interior of the Paul trap have a near-constant density (similar to a charged liquid in a confining harmonic-oscillator potential), all particles deep in the interior of the trap may be treated as equivalent, since they are experiencing approximately the same homogeneous surrounding charge density. Given that γ represents the energy loss per particle [see (1)], $\gamma_c(N)$ is expected to be constant. Thus, the small deviation of the $\gamma_c(N)$-scaling from constancy, i.e., the presence of the $\ln[\ln(N)]$ term, is a finite-size (surface) effect that is hard to capture analytically.

We now turn to a more in-depth investigation of the cloud $\rightarrow$ crystal phase transition, i.e., we focus on the interval $\gamma > \gamma_2 > \gamma_c$. In particular, we are interested in the time it takes for a cloud to crystallize, once it has achieved its metastable state (the plateau in Fig. 1), i.e., we are interested in the length of time τ_m the cloud spends in the metastable state before quickly transitioning into the crystalline state (ultimate exponential decay in Fig. 1). It is intuitively clear that the larger γ, the shorter τ_m. Conversely, when approaching γ_2 from above, and taking into account that clouds are stable for $\gamma < \gamma_1 \approx \gamma_c$, τ_m should increase as γ approaches $\gamma_2 \approx \gamma_c$. According to the theory of critical phenomena [22], this suggests a powerlaw dependence according to

$$\tau_m(N, a, q; \gamma) \sim [\gamma - \gamma_c(N, a, q)]^{-\beta(N,a,q)} \qquad (3)$$

for $\gamma \gtrsim \gamma_c$, where β is the critical exponent. To find β we ran our simulations for fixed N, a, q for γ values that approach $\gamma_c(N, a, q)$ from above and extracted τ_m via an automated, objective process [24]. Since the motion of the particles in the Paul trap is fully chaotic, small changes in the initial conditions can produce different values of τ_m. Therefore, we ran our simulations with fifty different initial conditions and defined $\bar{\tau}_m$ as the average over the fifty resulting τ_m values. To characterize the statistical spread of the τ_m values, we also computed the standard deviation $\sigma = [(1/50)\sum_{j=1}^{50}(\tau_m^{(j)} - \bar{\tau}_m)^2]^{1/2}$. For $q = 0.2$, Fig. 3 shows the resulting dependence of $\bar{\tau}_m$ on $(\gamma - \gamma_c)$ (plot symbols), where the error bars in Fig. 3 equal $\pm$ one standard deviation σ for each corresponding data point. If (3) holds, the data in Fig. 3 should fall on a straight line. Within the error bars in Fig. 3 this is indeed the case and we extract $\beta = 1.61 \pm 0.09$ from Fig. 3. We also notice that for the selected q value, β is approximately independent of a and N.

In order to investigate whether the observed powerlaw extends to other values of q, we ran additional simulations with $q = 0.15$ and $q = 0.25$. For $q = 0.15$ we obtained $\beta = 1.20 \pm 0.03$ and for $q = 0.25$ we obtained



FIG. 3: (Color online) Average time $\bar{\tau}_m$ spent in the metastable state versus the distance $\gamma - \gamma_c$ from the critical point γ_c for $q = 0.2, a = 0$ (oblate), $a = q^2/2$ (spherical), and $a = 4q^2/5$ (prolate) (triangles, circles, and squares, respectively) and $N = 100, 200$, and 500 (black, blue, and red plot symbols, respectively). The fit line corresponds to $\bar{\tau}_m \sim (\gamma - \gamma_c)^{-1.61}$

$\beta = 2.38 \pm 0.12$. This supports the validity of the powerlaw (3) with a critical exponent β that depends only on q, but not on a or N. According to the quoted uncertainties in β we see that the critical exponent is more accurately defined for smaller values of q. The reason for this is straightforward. According to (1), q determines the strength of the ac drive, which, in turn determines the degree of chaos in the trap. Therefore, smaller q means less chaos, which implies smaller $\Delta\gamma_c$, which, in turn, results in a better defined β.

But what about crystal $\rightarrow$ cloud transitions? Indeed, these were reported to occur as a function of reduced damping already in the earliest experiment on phase transitions in a Paul trap [4]. They are, however, of a completely different nature than the critical phenomena studied in this paper. Corroborating earlier results [3, 8], we found that in an ideal Paul trap described by (1), even in the absence of damping (i.e. $\gamma = 0$), crystal $\rightarrow$ cloud phase transitions do not occur. We checked this fact explicitly for many different a, q combinations, and N ranging from 25 to 200. The explanation is straightforward. There is no chaos in the crystal state. Therefore, crystals do not heat, and are therefore stable even in the absence of damping. In experiments that do observe crystal $\rightarrow$ cloud transitions, the crystals are heated by an outside source, for instance by coupling to the hot, ambient air in the experiments reported in [4]. Thus, while crystal $\rightarrow$ cloud transitions certainly occur in experiments in which the crystals are coupled to a heat bath, their underlying mechanism is completely different from the purely dynamical transitions studied in this paper. Nevertheless, these transitions provide an important and natural extension of the zero-temperature phenomena studied here to finite-temperature critical phenomena in periodically driven multi-particle systems, a promising field for future

research.

While our results and methods are broadly applicable to a host of many-particle systems in various areas of physics, which also show Wigner crystallization [15–21], *crystalline beams* [15, 16] are of particular importance. While some particle accelerators focus on the *energy frontier* (see, e.g., the Large Hadron Collider at CERN, Geneva) other particle accelerators focus on the *intensity frontier* (see, e.g., the Main Injector at Fermilab, Chicago). One way to approach the intensity frontier is via crystalline beams [15, 16], the ultimate quality particle beams with the best possible brilliance and intensity. It is well-known that in their rest frame the dynamics of the beam particles are described by equations very similar to (1), and that a phase transition, very similar to the one described in this paper, induced by laser or electron cooling, precedes the transition into the Wigner crystal [25]. This phase transition has not yet been analyzed in terms of critical exponents and is an obvious and important example for testing and verifying the universality of our predictions. We expect that because of their immediate applicability to crystalline beams, our results will be of interest to the accelerator community. We mention that Wigner crystallization has already been observed in a mini storage ring [26].

In conclusion, we showed that for charged particles stored in a Paul trap, a critical value, $\gamma_c(N, a, q)$, of the damping constant γ exists at which a cloud $\rightarrow$ crystal phase transition occurs. We showed that γ_c scales approximately like $\ln[\ln(N)]$ in the number N of stored particles in the trap. In addition, we showed that the cloud $\rightarrow$ crystal phase transition at γ_c may be interpreted as a critical phenomenon with a critical exponent β that predicts, given γ, the mean lifetime $\bar{\tau}_m$ of the metastable cloud before crystallization. Going beyond our atomic physics example, we conjecture that all damped, periodically driven, chaotic systems show a phase transition from a disordered (cloud) into an ordered (crystalline) state, characterized by powerlaws akin to the case of ions stored in a Paul trap discussed in this paper. Thus, the results reported in this paper are a step toward a comprehensive theory of phase transitions in periodically driven many-particle systems.

[1] W. Paul, Rev. Mod. Phys. **62**, 531 (1990).
[2] P. K. Ghosh, *Ion Traps* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995).
[3] R. Blümel, J. M. Chen, E. Peik, W. Quint, W. Schleich, Y. R. Shen, and H. Walther, Nature **334**, 309 (1988).
[4] R. F. Wuerker, H. Shelton, and R. V. Langmuir, J. Appl. Phys. **30**, 342 (1959).
[5] L. S. Brown, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 527 (1991).
[6] F. Diedrich, J. C. Bergquist, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 403 (1989).
[7] J. Hoffnagle, R. G. DeVoe, L. Reyna, and R. G. Brewer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 255 (1988).
[8] R. Blümel, C. Kappler, W. Quint, and H. Walther, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 808 (1989).
[9] D. S. Goodman, J. E. Wells, J. M. Kwolek, R. Blümel, F. A. Narducci, and W. W. Smith, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 012709 (2015).
[10] J. D. Tarnas, Y. S. Nam, and R. Blümel, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 041401(R) (2013).
[11] Y. S. Nam, E. B. Jones, and R. Blümel, Phys. Rev. A **90**, 013402 (2014).
[12] F. Diedrich, E. Peik, J. M. Chen, W. Quint, and H. Walther, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2931 (1987).
[13] D. J. Wineland, J. C. Bergquist, W. M. Itano, J. J. Bollinger, and C. H. Manney, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2935 (1987).
[14] E. Wigner, Phys. Rev. **46**, 1002 (1934).
[15] J. P. Schiffer and P. Kienle, Z. Phys. A **321**, 181 (1985).
[16] Y. Yuri and H. Okamoto, Phys. Rev. ST Accel. Beams **8**, 114201 (2005).
[17] H. Thomas, G. E. Morfill, and V. Demmel, J. Goree, B. Feuerbacher, and D. Mohlmann Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 652 (1994).
[18] T. E. Sheridan Physics of Plasmas **12**, 080701 (2005).
[19] *Two-Dimensional Electron Systems*, edited by E. Y. Andrei (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, 1997).
[20] E. R. Russell, F. Spaepen, and D. A. Weitz, Phys. Rev. E **91**, 032310 (2015).
[21] E. Tjhung and Ludovic Berthier, Phys. Rev. Lett **114**, 148301 (2015).
[22] R. Baierlein, Thermal Physics (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999).
[23] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery, *Numerical Recipes*, second edition (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1992).
[24] We compute a moving average of $\langle x^2 \rangle_{\Delta t}$ (averaging over a time interval $[t - \Delta t, t + \Delta t]$), which yields very sharp transitions suitable for an automatic and objective extraction of τ_m via a computer program. The choice of the interval Δt, which is of the order of the temporal transition width of the cloud $\rightarrow$ crystal transition, is not critical.
[25] H. Primack and R. Blümel, Phys. Rev. E **58**, 6578 (1998).
[26] T. Schätz, U. Schramm, and D. Habs, Nature **412**, 717 (2001).
[27] R. Blümel and U. Smilansky, Physics World **3 (2)**, 30 (1990).